

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 and 10 are pending.

In the last official action, the Examiner objected to the claims as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In response, independent claim 1 has been amended to include a recitation of technology (i.e., computer memory) in the body of the claim.

In the last official action, the Examiner objected to previous claims 7-9 on the ground that it was unclear from where the “message” came. In response, the claims have been amended to recite that the “message” is received from the party associated with the first order.

In the last official action, the Examiner rejected previous claims 1-10 for obviousness in view of Ordish, Autotrader.com and Friesen et al. For the reasons set forth below, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1, as amended herein, is neither shown nor suggested by the cited references.


As amended, claim 1 is directed to a computer-implemented method to trade objects over a network. A first order is received for an object having at least four dimensions. A message is received to modify said first order while said first order is pending, wherein said message is received from a party associated with the first order. The first order is modified in accordance with said message. A computer memory is searched for a second order with an object having said at least four dimensions, and the first order is matched with the second order in accordance with the search. Support for the amendments to claim 1 can be found, for example, in original claims 8-9, and at page 35, lines 18-19 (“[t]hese messages typically contain new buy and sell orders, modifications to existing orders, instructions to delete orders ...””)

None of the references cited by the Examiner, either alone or in combination, teach the steps of amended claim 1, which include modifying a pending order. In rejecting previous claims 8-10, the Examiner cited to Friesen (at para. 46) as disclosing the steps of receiving a message to change an order and changing the order in accordance with the message. While Friesen (at para. 46) arguably discloses an order modification function, the order modification functionality in Friesen is only available prior to submission of the order to the system. Friesen therefore does not disclose modification of a pending order, as recited in amended claim 1. The other references cited by the Examiner similarly fail to teach this limitation.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is submitted that pending independent claim 1 is in condition for allowance. It is respectfully submitted that all dependent claims are allowable because each such claim depends from an allowable base claim. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in the fees due in connection with this filing Deposit Account 50-0310. A duplicate of this authorization is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel H. Golub
Reg. No. 33,701
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1701 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
215-963-5055

Dated: April 18, 2005